

ABM file
February 16, 1967

expense of the trip, because the high and mighty have spoken—and that's that.

The powers that be have laid down guide lines and the high and mighty will see to it that the subjects walk that line, and they'd prefer to have no back talk. But of course there was and is a price tag on the guide lines. Practically every school board in South Carolina and the nation, have "complied" with the guide lines, and by complying, a certain amount of money, dollars, money of the realm has been granted these school boards with which to carry on their schools. That's where the guide lines come in—do as we say do and you get the money—fail to do as we say, and you get no money, Federal money, that is, money which the taxpayers provided in the first place.

We believe there was some protest about these guide lines by some school officials and some Senators and Congressmen, but the fact remains that the school boards went along with the plan under threat of having funds cut off.

And now, when the high and mighty decree that these school boards and hospitals must raise the pay of workers from \$1.25 an hour to \$1.40 an hour, they go running to Washington in protest. But we greatly fear the protests will avail them nothing.

If every school board and every hospital in the country had had the courage to stand up to the high and mighty and demanded that local school boards and local hospital boards be allowed to operate their institutions as they believe to be in the best interest of the people whom they serve, then the high and mighty would have been forced to let freedom ring and the local institutions would have been permitted to run their own affairs.

People can see their freedoms slipping away and they do not like what they see, but when the Federal government puts an offer of money on these freedoms the money seems to win every time—and freedom loses.

For the Veterans of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has been most gratifying to see the response of the newspapers and other news media of this Nation to the President's message to Congress on veterans benefits. We all seem to be agreed upon one thing—that the men of this Nation who are fighting in Vietnam are the finest ever to shoulder arms for the sake of liberty and freedom. And, we are likewise agreed upon another point—that these veterans should be recognized by the extension of benefits afforded to all other veterans who have taken part in combat.

I commend the President for his fine message, for which I am most happy to give my support. I likewise commend the press for its quick and favorable editorial comment in support of the President.

As an outstanding example of this comment, and support of the President's proposals, I am including this editorial from the February 2, 1967, issue of the *Inquirer*, Philadelphia, Pa., in the RECORD:

FOR THE VETERANS OF VIETNAM

In the context of history, there are large wars and there are small wars. There are

wars formally declared and there are wars informally designated as police actions or some such euphemism. There are all-out wars and there are limited wars.

To servicemen personally involved in warfare, the subtle distinctions in terminology are meaningless. For the American soldier who dies in a nameless rice paddy of Vietnam, it is the biggest war he will ever see. For his surviving kin, the tragic loss is total and final. For his battlefield buddies who carry on the fight, there are no limitations when circumstances of war require the last full measure of devotion.

It is self-evident, then, that veterans of the war in Vietnam should be eligible for educational and other benefits equivalent to those received by veterans of the World Wars and the Korean War.

President Johnson's message to Congress calls for appropriate upgrading of benefits to veterans of Vietnam, and to widows and surviving dependents. Congress already had initiated legislation along this line. We urge affirmative bipartisan action without delay.

Other proposals in the President's message on affairs of veterans may require further study by Congress, but seem eminently desirable in many instances. Especially essential, we believe, is an unqualified commitment of the American people to provide adequately and realistically for the widows and children of veterans who gave their lives in service to their country. Wounded and disabled war veterans also deserve continuing compassion and support from a grateful Nation.

Antimissile Missile System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, no issue that is before the country today is more important than the building and deployment of an antimissile missile system. The press has published much comment on this subject, the most recent being by columnist John Chamberlain. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD his column entitled "It May Be Too Late for Antiballistic Missile Agreement," published in the *Augusta, Ga., Chronicle*, of February 8, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT MAY BE TOO LATE FOR ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE AGREEMENT

(By John Chamberlain)

The argument that the United States should refrain from building and deploying an anti-ballistic missile, or ABM, system while our diplomats are dickering with the Russians to get them to hold off, too, has a great deal of theoretical merit.

But the issue may already be out of our hands. According to the best intelligence estimates, the Soviets have already spent some \$4 billion on anti-missile missile defenses, which, allowing for price differentials, would come to \$15 billion in U.S. money.

This means that they are well along in their ABM program, possibly to the point of no return.

Formidable opposition to pursuing a trust-Russia policy in the matter of an anti-missile moratorium is bound to crop up in the U.S. Senate within weeks or even days.

Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington is one Democrat who insists that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has been wrong to oppose deployment of an ABM system. And Sen. Tom Dodd of Connecticut is another member of President Lyndon Johnson's party who doubts the Soviets would observe good faith in accepting a halt to ABM construction.

Dodd, in fact, is planning a major speech on the subject; he will stress the probability that the Russians are already committed to their own ABM program, with their eyes particularly focussed on the lunatic regime in Red China, which may have deliverable missiles tomorrow.

Dodd is particularly worth listening to whenever he speaks on atomic matters, for he has had a record of consistent prophetic accuracy over the years. When the U.S. was observing the unofficial moratorium on nuclear testing, Dodd warned that the Russians would break it. This was precisely what happened, for the Soviet used the period of U.S. quiescence to push the development of large-yield nuclear technology. Because of this the U.S. had two years sliced off its four-year atomic lead over the Soviets. And as far back as 1960 Dodd was busy urging the U.S. to go ahead with anti-ballistic missile development. The Soviets were already committed to it, and when Khrushchev made his boast that he could knock a fly out of the sky Dodd took it with prudent seriousness.

Dodd wonders what Khrushchev might have done in the Cuban missile showdown if Moscow had had an ABM system at the time. He might have pushed John F. Kennedy one step further toward the brink, and who knows what might have followed? The point is that if one side has chips to throw into the diplomatic pot, the other side must also have them if the cautionary balance of terror is to be maintained.

If the Russians refuse to pull back in their ABM program, the U.S. has no alternative but to match the Kremlin. This will be the substance of Dodd's warning as outlined to me in conversation. The speech should be well worth pondering.

Parable of the Wolf, or, a Believability Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the worker-taxpayer and patriotic-minded citizen also cherished Abe Lincoln's birthday, remembering "you can fool part of the people all of the time and all of the people part of the time, but—"

In view of the intended program to be presented to Congress asking for an anti-crime program, I am asking that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY which appeared in the *Evening Star* here in Washington on February 15, 1967.

The article follows:

HUMPHREY PLEDGES AID TO DRIVE AGAINST CRIME

(By Shirley Elder)

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey responded to pleas from distraught crime-plagued District businessmen yesterday with a firm pledge of support and said they, too, must do their share.

The vice president urged business leaders to form an "action group" to help the administration lobby on Capitol Hill for more money to fight the ever-increasing crime rate here.

"I want you to know," Humphrey said, "that I will do all that I can to obtain from the Congress the funds necessary to establish effective law enforcement in the District and to establish it now."

"We need the backing of every group and interest in the District on behalf of this effort. The time is at hand for business, labor, religious and civic groups to act under the mandate for action which has been spelled out by the President—and to go to the Congress in person to obtain the financial support necessary."

The Humphrey statement came in letters to Richard H. Sinclair, president of the D.C. Savings and Loan League, and G. B. Burrus, president and chairman of the board of Peoples Drug Stores.

Another call for an increase in the war on crime came from the Washington D.C. Retail Liquor Dealers Association, which demanded "strong remedial legislation" to curb the rising tide of robberies.

Hilliard Schulberg, association executive director, said that since 1965 more than 250 holdups and four murders have occurred in stores operated by members of the association.

In a letter to President Johnson, Schulberg urged that suspects charged with violent crime who have prior criminal records not be released on bail before trial. He also called for an increase in police manpower.

Humphrey also released a copy of a letter written last week to another concerned businessman, chairman Robert Baker of the D.C. Clearing House.

"You have performed an important service . . ." Humphrey told Baker. "I hope that you are encouraged, as I am, by President Johnson's strong recommendation (to Congress) . . . When the President says that 'public order is the first business of government,' I think you can take that to mean we are going to see action."

TIME FOR ACTION

However, "action in this case means money," Humphrey listed these problems in the District:

"Police and prosecutors' offices all are understaffed and underpaid. District police should be better trained and better equipped; racial bars should be dropped, and police-community relations should be more pleasant."

Ideally, Humphrey continued, police precinct stations should be centers of "positive community education for law enforcement." And the District should have the "best technical facilities money can buy."

Humphrey also put in a plug for a law to restrict the easy traffic in hand guns.

MUST "PAY THE PRICE"

In an obvious reference to the charge that recent court decisions have weakened law enforcement, Humphrey said it is possible to protect the majority and still guarantee individual rights; "We can do both, but we must be willing to pay the price."

The protesting letters have been published as full-page newspaper ads to dramatize the businessman's anxiety. On behalf of Peoples, for instance, Burrus printed a list of 62 burglaries and 31 armed robberies suffered by the chain's stores in the last 56 weeks.

Burrus said the dollar loss was \$116,000 and warned that "every crime listed carried the seeds of grave human tragedy . . ." The pace of these crimes, he wrote, is "accelerating rather than abating."

Mr. Speaker, for some strange reason this national leader feels that crime can only be controlled if we, the American people, are able to "pay the price." This provokes a question as to why the re-

sponsible taxpayer-citizen who has suffered through the breakdown of law and order should be now saddled with another deduction from his paycheck to bail out the same leaders who have in the past encouraged disrespect for local law and order. Since many of our people have short memories, I am asking that the article covering a speech by the Honorable Charles E. Whittaker, former Supreme Court Justice, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star under date of February 15, be inserted at this point to refresh their memories on the events of a year ago.

The article follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE ENCOURAGED, WHITTAKER SAYS

A former Supreme Court justice last night accused President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and American church leaders of encouraging violation of the law by civil rights demonstrators.

The attack came from Charles E. Whittaker, who retired in 1962, in the opening lecture of a three-part seminar on law, order and civil disobedience sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute, a conservatively oriented nonpartisan educational institution. The seminar is being held at George Washington University.

Whittaker cited a 1964 statement by Rusk: "If I were a Negro, I too would demonstrate."

Then he cited a statement by Humphrey last year that if he had to live in the slums "you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions."

Finally, he quoted the President's remarks in August 1965, to demonstrators at the White House: "I am proud this morning to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. Neither you nor I are willing to accept the tyranny of poverty. . . . I hope that you . . . will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here. . . ."

Reasonable minds cannot doubt, Whittaker said, that such statements constituted an endorsement of civil disobedience, even though not intended as such.

Alluding to support of Negro civil rights movements in the South by "Northern whites," including ministers and other church people, Whittaker said their support of demonstrations vocally, physically or financially put them in a position where they "cannot now escape a measure of responsibility" for the results of the demonstrations.

Whittaker said he was sure that "a large majority of American Negroes are law-abiding citizens of good sense and do not subscribe to, and will have no truck with, the preachments of some self-appointed Negro leaders that have exhorted and incited Negroes to violate our laws. . . . My criticisms are of those misguided and irresponsible self-appointed Negro leaders who have exhorted and incited others to violate our laws, and of the relatively small percentage of our Negroes—usually the poorest and least educated ones—who have fallen under the spell of these leaders and have been carrying out their exhortations."

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, it would appear no additional money is needed on a Federal level, no more judges or peace officers must immediately be recruited. Rather, government should let the dedicated jurists and lawmen alone and, under the eye of society in their own backyard, if permitted to proceed unhindered I am convinced they will restore law and order, and deter crime.

In lieu of pleas and leadership against

the taxpayer I feel we should encourage those in high places to turn their pleas toward the beatniks and the street legions and the preachers, and talk to them—reason with them—in the terms of dignity, honor, loyalty, thrift, and respect for law and order, certainly the result could but stop the confusion in our land, diminish crime with the desired effect of restoring the greatest achievement of our Government; peace of mind and there would be no need for the additional taxes to set up a Federal machine to control crime.

Interview With Comedian Don Knotts— Native West Virginian—Discuss Fond Memories of West Virginia—Tells of Start in Show Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, actor-comedian Don Knotts, a native of Morgantown, W. Va., was recently interviewed by Editor Randy Murray for the December 1966, issue of *Business Communications*, a quarterly publication of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., of West Virginia.

The famous personality recalls experiences as a youngster and offers some observations on the future of West Virginia.

As a graduate of West Virginia University and a member of Phi Sigma Kappa Fraternity, he stays in touch with the university and has many friends there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the interview with this four-time Emmy winner printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIAN IN THE HOLLYWOOD HILLS

(By Randy Murray)

(West Virginia-born Don Knotts, destined for show business even as a youngster growing up in Morgantown, credits his hometown for early encouragement discusses the events leading to his present movie career, and offers some observations on his native State).

Hollywood, that unique little suburb of sprawling Los Angeles, remains the film capital of America, even while its claim as the world's capital is debated.

Amid tall, aging palms and colorful stucco residences, movie companies prosper. And alongside them allied businesses—splicing firms, sound specialists, color experts, and smaller outfits catering to newsreel and industrial trailing films—enjoy apparent wealth.

The city and its people are a study in contrast—there is a mixture if not a compound of the conventional and the bazaar. Where else in America will you find pink fire hydrants, youngsters on every corner selling maps to the stars' residences, and an army of "Hollywood types" complete with wildly clashing colors of clothing, sunglasses after